

122764

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

South Carolina Department
of Youth Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

SOUTH CAROLINA DELINQUENT MALES:

A Follow-up Into Adult Corrections

South Carolina Department of Youth Services
Richard E. McLawhorn, Commissioner

122764

SOUTH CAROLINA DELINQUENT MALES:

A Follow-up Into Adult Corrections

Jan Rivers

Trudie Trotti

South Carolina Department of Youth Services
1122 Lady Street
P. O. Box 7367
Columbia, SC 29202

August, 1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without data from the South Carolina Departments of Corrections and Probation, Parole and Pardons. The Department of Youth Services gratefully acknowledges their contributions.

Al Hoy, senior programmer, and Roan Garcia-Quintana, statistician, provided the necessary programming and statistical services for this study. They also offered generous personal support and interest, which makes a difference.

Advice and critique were offered by Carol Burgess of Maricopa County Juvenile Court, Arizona, and Howard Snyder of the National Center for Juvenile Justice. Their advice contributed to the quality of the report.

Executive Summary

The study is a follow-up of 39,250 males born between 1964 and 1971, and having official delinquency records in South Carolina, to determine how many recidivated as inmates of the State Department of Corrections or as adult probationers. Adult agencies records were checked through 12/31/88, meaning that length eligibility for the adult system varied from less than one year to eight years depending on the subject's date of birth. A total of 6,351 matches in the adult system were found, with the highest rate (27%) occurring in the oldest birth group (1964). Delinquent males born in 1967, selected for a special separate analysis, had a match rate of 20% after four to five years of adult eligibility.

Examination of the study population's characteristics as juvenile offenders using one year, e.g., the 1967 cohort, revealed that males having only one court contact for delinquency were unlikely to recidivate as adults (probability = 13%). For subjects having at least one juvenile disposition of probation the probability of adult criminality increased to 29%, while those institutionalized at least once as juveniles recidivated in adulthood at a rate of 56%.

The study also verified that substantial proportions of adult inmates and probationers born in 1964-71 had juvenile records in South Carolina (45% and 27%, respectively), and that birth groups 1964-71 of adult offenders under supervision fill out first with former juvenile delinquents.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the juvenile justice system is to prevent future delinquent and criminal behavior. When young people violate the law, the system attempts to balance justice and treatment needs in a manner that holds the juvenile accountable while providing the means for a change in behavior. The proportion of youth referred to Family Court who reoffend as adults is the ultimate indicator of the effectiveness of the system. If the percentage is low, we can conclude that some juvenile justice programs work -- either because they actively assist troubled adolescents in making a successful transition to adulthood or, because the system provides a measure of intervention/ supervision until youth mature out of antisocial behavior. If the percentage is high, a "rethinking" of philosophy and methods may be in order.

Once the rate at which ex juvenile offenders recidivate as adults is established, a host of other issues and questions emerge. Among these are:

1. What is the probability of adult criminality when the study population is subdivided by key social and judicial variables such as race, family history of criminal justice involvement, number of delinquency referrals and number of institutionalizations as a juvenile?
2. What social and judicial characteristics are significantly different when the study population is divided for comparison between delinquents with clear adult records and those who go on to adult criminal careers?
3. To what extent are former South Carolina juvenile delinquents represented in the populations of the adult criminal justice agencies -- South Carolina Department of Corrections and the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardons? and
4. How do former juvenile offenders in adult corrections differ from adult offenders with no delinquency history?

The following study begins to answer these questions based on a population of male offenders born between 1964 and 1971 and having an official delinquency history through the South Carolina Department of Youth Services (hereinafter DYS).

A Word About South Carolina's Juvenile Justice System

Studies of this kind invite comparison to research conducted in other states and municipalities. To some extent, the generalizability of these findings may be dependent upon the generalizability of South Carolina and its juvenile justice system. Over three million people reside in South Carolina, a predominantly rural and "small town" state with no major metropolitan areas. Within this total population the subgroup of children who are age eligible for delinquency has ranged from 420,000 to 450,000 between 1980 and 1988. In 1988, delinquency referrals to Family Court intake (17,158) represented about 4% of the age eligible grouping.

The South Carolina Department of Youth Services is the State agency which administers all community and institutional juvenile justice services, including: Family Court Intake and Detention Screening; Probation and Parole; Predispositional Evaluation; Institutional Supervision and Treatment; and Community Alternative Programs, both Residential and Nonresidential. This differs from other states which may incorporate juvenile justice programs with human services in a "cabinet" or "umbrella" organization, with the adult corrections agencies, or with county-level administration of intake, probation and parole.

While the juvenile justice systems in the majority of states have original jurisdiction over youth until their eighteenth birthday, South Carolina's maximum age of jurisdiction for delinquency and status offense matters extends only through the 16th year. Additionally, in South Carolina status offense matters (e.g., running away from home, truancy, and ungovernability) remain under Family Court jurisdiction, while in many other states social service agencies have the primary responsibility for these behaviors. For the past several years, status offenders have accounted for over 30% of South Carolina's Family Court intake referrals.

In South Carolina, a juvenile offender must be twelve years old before he can be committed to a correctional institution. Youth who commit heinous crimes (e.g., murder, criminal sexual assault) may be waived at any age to Circuit Court for trial as an adult after a full investigation by the Family Court. Waiver is also allowed for youth as young as 14 who are repetitive and serious offenders, although this provision is used only rarely, and for youth who are sixteen and charged with a criminal offense. The number of youth waived to adult court in any given year has not exceeded 20.

METHOD

This study was enabled by DYS's automated client information system, which contains the complete judicial history of each client and an array of family and social information. DYS also obtained data from South Carolina's two supervisory criminal justice agencies: Probation, Parole and Pardon (PPP) for adults under community supervision, and the Department of Corrections (SCDC) for institutionalized adult offenders. The data tapes from SCDC and PPP contained basic identifying information on each adult offender along with date(s) and the most serious offense associated with each commitment to the agency(ies).

Juvenile and adult records were matched by comparing name, sex, race and date of birth. Each client was counted only once for an unduplicated rate of adult recidivism. If a former juvenile offender had more than one adult sentence, only the more serious sanction was counted. The study does not yet provide a recidivism measure at the arrest level.*

*The South Carolina Law Enforcement Division has furnished this data; analysis is currently being conducted.

The study population consisted of males born between 1964 and 1971 who had official delinquency records through the South Carolina Department of Youth Services. Females were deleted from this initial study because of their relatively low involvement in delinquent behavior, the high probability that a female's last name would change from the juvenile to the adult system and the small likelihood that female delinquents will become active in the adult system. Furthermore, since tracking was limited to juveniles with an official delinquency history in South Carolina and recidivism was checked only through South Carolina corrections agencies, the effects of in/out migration and death are not accounted for in the study.

It should be noted that the length of follow-up for recidivism varies according to birth cohort. Recidivism in the adult system was verified through December of 1988, meaning that the 1964 birth cohort was followed into the twenty-fourth year, (seven to eight years of eligibility for adult charges), while the 1971 birth cohort was followed into the seventeenth year, (one year or less of adult eligibility). A detailed analysis of one birth cohort is presented following the summary findings.

FINDINGS

Matches of Former Male Juvenile Offenders in the Adult System. Analysis shows that at age 24, with seven to eight years of eligibility, only 27 percent of juvenile offenders had recidivated as adults. Within the entire study population of 39,250 individual male juvenile offenders born between 1964 and 1971, 84% or 32,899, did not appear in the adult system. While the percentage will decrease somewhat as longer periods of follow-up occur, these preliminary results are promising. The large majority of youth referred to Family Courts for delinquency appear to grow into law abiding citizens, passing through the high risk young adult years without contacting the State's criminal justice agencies.

Six thousand three hundred and fifty-one (6,351) former South Carolina delinquent males, or 16% of the study population, were matched to an adult record. These included 2,447, or 6%, whose most serious adult disposition was community probation, and 3,904, or 10%, found incarcerated in adult institutions. The peak birth cohorts for matches overall were those containing the oldest adults: 1964, 1965 and 1966 at 27%, 24%, and 22% respectively. The younger cohorts born after 1966 likely will exhibit a similar match pattern once their members age through the twenty-fourth birthday.

Table I

**Adult Recidivism Results by Birth Cohort of Previous
South Carolina Juvenile Offenders**

Birth Cohort	Age as of 12/31/88	Approximate Years of Adult Eligibility	Male Juvenile Offender Records	Clear Adult Record	Adult Corrections Match*
				n=32,899	n=6,351
1964	24	Eight (8)	4,215	73%	27%
1965	23	Seven (7)	4,630	76%	24%
1966	22	Six (6)	4,543	78%	22%
1967	21	Five (5)	4,462	80%	20%
1968	20	Four (4)	4,695	83%	17%
1969	19	Three (3)	5,212	87%	13%
1970	18	Two (2)	5,723	90%	10%
1971	17	One (1)	5,770	97%	3%
8 Year Total	-	-	39,250	84%	16%

Probability of Adult Criminality Based on Selected Social and Judicial Variables. For this analysis the study population of 39,250 former South Carolina male delinquents is divided into subgroups by single key variables to compute probabilities associated with adult criminality. Looking first at the social variables, proportionately more black male delinquents matched to an adult record than white male delinquents. Stronger associations with adult criminality also were found in: delinquents from single parent families and other living arrangements such as relatives' homes or foster care, those whose families have other delinquent or criminal members, those

*"Adult Corrections Match" is defined as having a record with the South Carolina Department of Corrections or the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardons. Persons having records in both Departments were counted only once in Corrections.

whose families are in lower annual income brackets, and those not attending school or attending in special education classrooms, as illustrated below:

Table II
Probability of Adult Criminality Based on
Selected Social Variables
Observed in S.C. Male Delinquents

<u>Social Variable:</u>	<u>No. of Delinquent Records</u>	<u>No. of Adult Systems Matches</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Criminality Based on This Variable</u>
<u>Race:</u>			
White	23,458	3,331	14%
Black	15,212	3,037	20%
<u>Family Living Arrangement:</u>			
Natural Parents	13,226	1,881	14%
Single Parent	12,916	2,405	19%
Parent/Stepparent	4,318	738	17%
Other	4,054	895	22%
<u>Family Criminal/ Delinquent History:</u>			
No	25,532	3,916	15%
Yes	7,840	1,837	23%
<u>Family Annual Income:</u>			
Less than \$10,000	14,340	3,045	21%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	11,433	1,959	17%
\$20,000 or greater	7,478	795	11%
<u>School Attendance:</u>			
Normal Classroom Setting	26,438	3,976	15%
Not Attending	4,193	1,144	27%
Special Education Program	3,384	690	20%
Other	695	155	22%

Looking at an array of judicial and processing variables, it is clear that the likelihood of adult criminality increases as male delinquents have sustained and repetitive contacts with the juvenile justice system. For example, in total delinquency referrals the chance of adult criminality more than doubles when males with only one referral (probability=10%) are compared to those with two or more referrals (probability=27%). The probability

increases with each court contact to 45% for youth having six or more referrals. Similar patterns are seen in total number of delinquency adjudications and probation dispositions.

A dramatic distinction occurs in probability of adult criminality when the population is divided into youth who were institutionalized one or more times as delinquents (probability=46%) and those who were not (probability=14%). Furthermore, each incidence of institutionalization increases the likelihood of adult involvement as follows:

<u>Judicial Variable</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Criminality</u>
Never institutionalized as a delinquent	14%
One institutionalization	41% ---
Two institutionalizations	53%
Three institutionalizations	58%
Four institutionalizations	67% ---
	46% Overall

In offense categories, property and person type crimes generate the highest probabilities of adult criminality and status type offenses the lowest probabilities whether one looks at the first referral offense or the most serious adjudicated offense, which is shown below:

<u>Judicial Variable</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Criminality</u>
Most serious adjudicated offense = Act Against Property	29%
Most serious adjudicated offense = Act Against Person	28%
Most serious adjudicated offense = public order or other criminal	19%
Most serious adjudicated offense = status	12%

(Refer to Table III, Appendix, for Greater Detail.)

Factors Differentiating Male Delinquents Who Become Adult Criminals From Those Who Do Not. This section is a preliminary analysis splitting the study population to compare the 32,899 male delinquents with no adult record to the 6,351 male delinquents who have become active in the adult system as probationers or inmates of the Department of Corrections. All comparisons were subjected to a difference of proportions test to determine statistical significance. Comparisons were made on the basis of individual factors with no attempt at this time to determine how variables may cluster together to establish an "at risk" profile with high predictive validity.

Looking first at social variables, male delinquents with adult records are more likely to be black than their counterparts who have not entered the adult system. This difference is accounted for entirely within the Department of Corrections subset, while the racial distribution of former delinquents who appear only as adult probationers is identical to those with clear adult records. Other social factors associated with male delinquents now in the adult system are a higher incidence of single parent or other living arrangements at the time the subjects were juveniles, a higher incidence of criminal or delinquent behavior among family members and lower annual family incomes. In school attendance as a juvenile, the adult system matches are more likely to show non-attendance or special education status than those delinquents who have maintained clear adult records:

Variable	Clear Adult Record	Adult System Match	SCDC Match	PPP Match
Delinquent, Race = Black	38%	48%*	54%*	38%
Delinquent, Living Arrangement = Single Parent or Other Setting	47%	56%*	58%*	51%*
Delinquent, Family has Other Criminal/Delinquent Members	22%	32%*	34%*	28%*
Delinquent, Family Annual Income = <\$10,000 at Time of Delinquency	41%	53%*	57%*	46%*
Delinquent, was Not Attending School or had Special Education Status	20%	30%*	33%*	26%*

(Refer to Table IV, Appendix, for greater detail)

Comparison by judicial and processing variables in the juvenile record reveals substantial differences between delinquents who have not recidivated as adults and those found in the adult system. The adult recidivist group has a much higher likelihood of recidivism as a juvenile, e.g., more than one delinquency referral, and one or more delinquency adjudications. Sanctions of probationary supervision and institutionalization as a juvenile also occur more frequently in the adult recidivist group than in delinquents having no adult record. The adult recidivists tend to begin their juvenile histories as more serious offenders -- charged with an act against person or

*Statistically significant; $P < .01$; difference of proportions test; see Table XI, Appendix, for Z values.

property -- and are more likely, if adjudicated as a juvenile, for the most serious offense to have been an act against person or property:

Variable	Clear Adult Record	Adult System Match	SCDC Match	PPP Match
2 More Delinquency Referrals	32%	62%*	68%*	51%*
1 or More Delinquency Adjudications	44%	71%*	76%*	63%*
Probation as a Juvenile	31%	49%*	52%*	46%*
Institutionalized as a Juvenile	6%	24%*	30%*	14%*
Person or Property Offense Charged at First Referral	42%	51%*	54%*	46%*
Person or Property Adjudication**	57%	74%*	78%*	62%*

(Refer to Table V, Appendix, for greater detail)

Juvenile Offenders in the Adult System. In this section former South Carolina juvenile offenders who recidivated as adults are examined within the totality of the adult system.

It should be re-emphasized that the matches found reflect only adult offenders with delinquency records in South Carolina. Undoubtedly both adult agencies have offenders with delinquency records in other states. Similarly, adult corrections agencies in some other states will have offenders with South Carolina delinquency records. It is beyond the scope of this study to track in and out migration to and from other states.

The adult system population as of 12/31/88 included of 17,640 unduplicated individuals assigned to either SCDC or PPP whose dates of birth fall between 1964 and 1971. Of that number, 6,351 matched a South Carolina juvenile record for a rate of 36%, overall. Within the SCDC subset, 3,904 juvenile records were matched in a total of 8,692 inmate files for a rate of 45%. Looking at the remaining 8,948 files on adult probationers (with duplicates to SCDC removed), 2,447 juvenile matches were found for a rate of 27%.

It is interesting to note the degree of variation in match rate by cohort year. The youngest cohorts, 1970 and 1971, show overall match rates of 59% and 57%, respectively. Fully 65% of SCDC inmates born in 1970 are former juvenile offenders, compared to only 34% of inmates born in 1964. This suggests that birth cohort groups within SCDC (and PPP as well) fill out

* Statistically significant; $P = <.01$; difference of proportions test; see Table XI, Appendix, for Z values.

**Percentage based on juveniles having an adjudication, not all juveniles.

first variance with former juvenile delinquent offenders whose recidivism is occurring early in their eligibility for the adult system:

Table VI

Adult System Matches to South Carolina Delinquent Records
by Birth Cohort

Birth Cohort	Adult System Files			SCDC Files			PPP Files		
	Total	S.C. Del. Record	% of Total	Total	S.C. Del. Record	% of Total	Total	S.C. Del. Record	% of Total
1964	4,187	1,131	27%	2,066	710	34%	2,121	421	20%
1965	3,559	1,108	31%	1,712	698	41%	1,847	410	22%
1966	2,805	983	35%	1,360	608	45%	1,145	375	26%
1967	2,441	908	37%	1,197	572	48%	1,244	336	27%
1968	1,963	797	40%	958	498	52%	1,005	299	30%
1969	1,418	687	48%	756	405	54%	662	282	43%
1970	947	555	59%	477	311	65%	470	244	52%
1971	320	182	57%	166	102	61%	154	80	52%
8 YEAR TOTAL	17,640	6,351	36%	8,692	3,904	45%	8,948	2,447	27%

On two variables, race and offense category, it is possible to compare adult offenders without delinquent histories to those who exhibit delinquent histories. In both SCDC and PPP, the offenders having a juvenile background are more likely to be white:

	SCDC/Not Delinquent	SCDC/ Delinquent	PPP/Not Delinquent	PPP/ Delinquent
Race = White	41%	46%*	60%	62%

The adult offense category in both agencies showed a somewhat higher propensity for property type offenses among former delinquents than other adult offenders without a delinquent history:

	SCDC/Not Delinquent	SCDC/ Delinquent	PPP/Not Delinquent	PPP/ Delinquent
Adult Offense = Property	55%	63%*	28%	33%*

*Statistically significant; $P = < .01$; difference of means test; see Table XI, Appendix, for Z values.

(Refer to Table VII, Appendix, for greater detail)

ANALYSIS OF THE 1967 BIRTH COHORT

There are two basic and related reasons why we have isolated delinquent males born in 1967 for separate analysis. The first concerns completeness of the juvenile offender data. Members of the 1967 cohort would have been ten to eleven years of age when South Carolina juvenile offender records were automated in mid-1978. Only rarely does the onset of delinquency predate the tenth birthday. Therefore, on "time-bound" predictor variables such as total number of delinquency referrals it is reasonably certain that entire juvenile records have been accounted for in the analysis. This assumption would be erroneous for some older youth in the 1964-66 birth cohorts.

The second reason for a separate analysis of the 1967 group is length of follow-up. Delinquents born in 1967 turned seventeen in 1984, allowing four to five years of tracking into adult-eligibility.** Had any of the younger cohorts been selected instead, the adult follow-up period would have been shorter and less adequate.

In other words, the 1967 birth cohort offers the best opportunity to analyze predictor variables in the delinquency history with reasonable assurance of complete juvenile offender data, and to determine the prevalence of recidivism based on a reasonable period of eligibility for adult sanctions. Assuming that the social and judicial characteristics of the 1967 birth cohort approximate those of the entire original population (containing birth cohorts 1964-1971 inclusive), we can conclude that the adult recidivism trends reported here are generalizable to the entire population.

Social and Judicial Characteristics of S. C. Delinquent Males Born in 1967. This section presents the social and judicial characteristics of 4,462 males born in 1967 and having an official delinquency record in South Carolina. The descriptions reflect individual and family characteristics as documented at the time of delinquency.

In racial composition the 1967 group was 59% white and 41% black. Family data indicated that 40% lived with their natural parents and 37% in single parent households. Eighty-one percent (81%) of families reported an annual income of less than \$20,000, and 47% an income of less than \$10,000. Most of these families, however, did not contain other delinquent or criminal members (77%). The delinquent subjects generally attended school in normal classroom settings (78%) with 11% not attending, either by choice or expulsion, and 9% in special education programs.

At the judicial level, most of the delinquent males born in 1967 evidenced only one delinquency referral to Family Court Intake (63%), and one-half of the group had no delinquency adjudications. The more chronic delinquency patterns, e.g., four or more court referrals, three or more

**The cutoff for checking adult recidivism was 12-31-88.

adjudications, and two or more dispositions of probation, were observed infrequently (11%, 9% and 12% respectively). Ninety-one percent of the male delinquents born in 1967 were never institutionalized in a long term juvenile correctional facility, while 6% were committed one time. Multiple commitments were rare (3%). Property type crimes prevailed both in first referral offense (38%) and in most serious adjudicated offense (54%).

(Refer to Table VIII)

The social and judicial characteristics of delinquent males born in 1967 appear very much the same as those discussed in previous reporting for the original study population of delinquent males born between 1964 and 1971. As we examine probability of adult criminality in the next section, we can assume that the larger population would show a similar pattern given a four to five year follow-up for adult eligibility and equivalent (complete) juvenile offender data.

Probability of Adult Criminality Based on Selected Social and Judicial Variables. As noted in previous reporting, 908 members of the 1967 birth cohort of South Carolina delinquent males matched an adult record of either the S. C. Department of Corrections or the Department of Probation, Parole and Pardons, for an overall recidivism rate of 20% in the adult system. This section will present recidivism rates when the cohort membership is split according to key social and judicial variables.

Looking first at social variables, the probability of adult recidivism was higher for black former delinquents than white former delinquents. Adult recidivism also was more associated with former delinquents not living with both parents, those whose families had other criminal or delinquent members, and those whose families were in the lowest income bracket:

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Recidivism</u>
Delinquent, Race = White	18%
Delinquent, Race = Black	25%
Delinquent, Living W/Natural Parents	18%
Delinquent, All Other Living Arrangements	23%
Delinquent, No Family Criminal History	19%
Delinquent, Family Criminal History	29%
Delinquent, Family Income \$10,000 or More	18%
Delinquent, Family Income <\$10,000	25%

Additionally, former delinquents who were not attending school as juveniles, and those attending but placed in a program other than normal

classroom setting were more likely to resurface in the adult system than those whose schooling took place in regular classrooms:

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Recidivism</u>
Delinquent - Attending School in Normal Classroom	19%
Delinquent - Not Attending School, Special Education or Other	30%

(Refer to Table IX for more detail)

Looking at the array of judicial and processing variables, it is clear that the likelihood of adult criminality increases as delinquent males have sustained and repetitive contacts with the juvenile justice system. For example, in total delinquency referrals the chance of adult criminality is more than 2.5 times greater for delinquent males with two or more referrals (probability = 34%) than for delinquent males having only one referral (probability = 13%). The probability increases with each court contact, exceeding 50% for five referrals and peaking at 60% for six or more referrals. Similar patterns are seen in delinquency adjudications, dispositions of probation, and temporary commitments for predispositional evaluations.

A dramatic distinction occurs in probability of adult criminality when the 1967 birth cohort of delinquent males is divided into youth who were institutionalized in long term correctional facilities at least once as juveniles (probability = 56%) and those never institutionalized (probability = 17%). Furthermore, each incidence of institutionalization increases the likelihood of adult involvement, as follows:

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Criminality</u>
Never institutionalized as a delinquent	17%
Institutionalized at least once:	56%
Institutionalized one time	54%
Institutionalized twice	59%
Institutionalized three times or more	68%

In offense categories, person and property type crimes committed as juveniles generate the highest probabilities of adult criminality and status offenses the lowest, whether one looks at first referral offense or the most serious adjudicated offense, which is presented below:

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Probability of Adult Criminality</u>
Most Serious Adjudicated Offense=	
Act Against Person	37%
Act Against Property	33%
Public Order/Other Criminal	21%
Status Offense	17%

(Refer to Table X for More Detail)

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This follow-up of 39,250 delinquent males into young adulthood is good news for juvenile justice practitioners. To find an adult recidivism rate of only 27% for the oldest cohort, followed for seven to eight high risk years indicates that either juvenile justice is doing its job of preparing troubled adolescents for adulthood or that youth learn from experience and mature into law abiding citizens in the large majority of cases.

The data also reveal that certain judicial, processing and social variables (race, family structure and income, school attendance status, number of delinquency referrals and adjudications, probation status as a juvenile, and institutionalization) generate higher probabilities of adult criminality and tend to differentiate male delinquents who recidivate as adults from those who do not. Given these basic indicators, the next step will be to determine what variables cluster together in the juveniles who become adult recidivists -- in other words to generate a valid high risk "profile". The capability to create this profile has obvious implications for developing preventive and interventive priorities within South Carolina's juvenile justice system.

As we look at the adult system, the importance of defining high risk and directing resources to lower the risk among associated children becomes very evident. It appears that juvenile delinquents who recidivate in adulthood do so rather quickly. As adults serving determinate sentences, they "stack up" in the adult system. The fact that at least 45% of Department of Corrections male inmates born between 1964 and 1971 came out of the juvenile justice system is especially compelling when the adult prison population is growing 13% per year and taxpayer dollars are being dedicated to new prison construction.

Profiling the 1967 cohort separately revealed that most had only one contact with South Carolina's Family Court system for delinquency, while half of the group had no delinquency adjudication. Property offenses tended to prevail over other types at the first referral and most serious adjudication levels. Over 90% of the group had never been incarcerated as juveniles in long term correctional facilities. Since these characteristics are consistent with the study population as a whole, it can be assumed that the entire population would display recidivism patterns similar to those of the 1967 cohort, given four to five years of adult eligibility.

The match rate of South Carolina delinquent males born in 1967 to adult offender records (SCDC or PPP) was 20%. In looking at the likelihood of adult criminality by single variables certain judicial factors, especially repeated processing and incarceration in long term correctional facilities generated high probabilities themselves without any more sophisticated statistical application to combine elements into a high risk profile.

While we may take some satisfaction in the knowledge that most South Carolina male delinquents born in 1967 did not recidivate as juveniles after the first Family Court contact, or as adults, there are compelling

probability statistics on repetitive and institutionalized delinquent offenders that command our attention: On the third delinquency referral for males the chance of adult criminal involvement becomes one in three; on the fifth referral the odds increase to more than 50/50; and the chances exceed 50/50 with only one juvenile institutionalization. These "odds" very effectively underscore the need to bolster programming for early, effective intervention in order to prevent the recurrence of delinquent behavior and the internalization as juveniles of criminal life-styles that carry over into adulthood.

Appendix

Table III
Probability of Adult Criminality Based on
Selected Judicial Variables
Observed in Delinquents

Judicial Variable:	No. of Delinquent Records	No. of Adult System Matches	Probability of Adult Criminality Based on this Variable
<u>Total Delinquency Referrals:</u>			
One	24,716	2,444	10%
Two or More	14,534	3,926	27%
Two	6,976	1,376	20%
Three	3,202	905	28%
Four	1,914	638	33%
Five	1,069	395	37%
Six or more	1,373	612	45%
<u>Total Delinquency Adjudications:</u>			
None	20,300	1,844	9%
One or More	18,950	4,526	23%
One	11,704	1,982	17%
Two	4,002	1,203	30%
Three	1,851	707	41%
Four	800	348	44%
Five	373	188	50%
Six or more	220	98	45%
<u>Total Probation Dispositions:</u>			
None	22,990	2,393	10%
One or More	16,260	3,977	24%
One	11,723	2,444	21%
Two	3,281	1,068	33%
Three	925	345	37%
Four	331	120	36%
<u>Total R&E Commitments:*</u>			
None	31,294	3,625	11%
One or More	7,956	2,745	35%
One	6,871	2,245	33%
Two	998	448	45%
Three or more	87	52	60%

*For predispositional evaluation

Table III - Continued
Probability of Adult Criminality Based on
Selected Judicial Variables
Observed in Delinquents

Judicial Variable:	No. of Delinquent Records	No. of Adult System Matches	Probability of Adult Criminality Based on this Variable
<u>Total Institutionalizations:</u>			
None	35,884	4,846	14%
One or More	3,366	1,534	46%
One	2,383	981	41%
Two	696	371	53%
Three	224	130	58%
Four or more	63	42	67%
<u>First Referral Offense:</u>			
Person	2,676	455	17%
Property	14,329	2,800	20%
Public Order/other criminal	14,035	1,967	14%
Status	8,161	1,139	14%
<u>Most Serious Adjudicated Offense:</u>			
Person	2,048	580	28%
Property	9,554	2,739	29%
Public Order/other criminal	4,549	862	19%
Status	2,733	333	12%

Table IV
Social Factors Differentiating
Male Delinquents Who Become Adult Criminals
from Those Who Do Not

<u>Social Factor:*</u>	<u>Delinquent:</u> <u>Clear Adult</u> <u>Record</u> n=32,899	<u>Delinquent:</u> <u>Adult</u> <u>System Match</u> n=6,351	<u>Delinquent:</u> <u>SCDC</u> <u>Match</u> n=3,904	<u>Delinquent:</u> <u>PPP</u> <u>Match</u> n=2,447
<u>Race:</u>				
White	62%	52%	46%	62%
Black	38%	48%	54%	38%
<u>Family Living</u> <u>Arrangement:</u>				
Natural Parents	40%	32%	30%	35%
Single Parent	37%	41%	42%	38%
Parent/Stepparent	13%	13%	12%	13%
Other	10%	15%	16%	13%
<u>Family Criminal/</u> <u>Delinquent History:</u>				
No	78%	68%	66%	72%
Yes	22%	32%	34%	28%
<u>Family Annual Income:</u>				
Less than \$10,000	41%	53%	57%	46%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	35%	34%	32%	37%
\$20,000 or greater	24%	14%	11%	18%
<u>School Attendance:</u>				
Normal Classroom				
Setting	78%	67%	65%	70%
Not Attending	11%	19%	20%	16%
Special Education				
Program	9%	11%	13%	10%
Other	2%	3%	3%	3%

*Social factors are those on record for the subject and/or his family when he was active in the juvenile justice system. They reflect status as a juvenile, not current adult status.

Table V

**Judicial and Process Factors
Differentiating Male Delinquents
Who Become Adult Criminals from Those Who Do Not**

Judicial Factor:	Delinquent: Clear Adult Record n=32,899	Delinquent: Adult System Match n=6,351	Delinquent: SCDC Match n=3,904	Delinquent: PPP Match n=2,447
<u>Total Delinquency Referrals:</u>				
One	68%	38%	32%	47%
Two	17%	22%	22%	21%
Three or More	15%	40%	46%	30%
<u>Total Delinquency Adjudications:</u>				
None	56%	29%	24%	37%
One	30%	31%	30%	33%
Two	8%	19%	21%	15%
Three or More	6%	21%	25%	15%
<u>Total Probation Dispositions:</u>				
None	69%	51%	48%	54%
One	26%	37%	37%	36%
Two	4%	10%	12%	8%
Three or More	1%	2%	3%	2%
<u>Total Institutionalizations:</u>				
None	94%	76%	70%	86%
One	4%	15%	19%	10%
Two	1%	6%	7%	3%
Three or More	1%	3%	4%	1%
<u>First Referral Offense:</u>				
Act Against Person	7%	7%	7%	7%
Act Against Property	35%	44%	47%	39%
Act Against Public Order/Other	37%	31%	28%	36%
Status	21%	18%	18%	18%
<u>Most Serious Adjudicated Offense:*</u>				
	n=14,370*	n=4,514*	n=2,963*	n=1,551*
Act Against Person	10%	13%	14%	13%
Act Against Property	47%	61%	64%	49%
Act Against Public Order/Other	26%	19%	15%	29%
Status	17%	7%	7%	10%

*These percentages are based on number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent rather than total number of delinquent records.

Table VII

Comparison of Adult Male Criminals With Delinquent Histories
and Those With No Delinquent History
by Race and Offense Category

	SCDC Inmate- No S.C. Delinquent History n=4,788 (55%)	SCDC Inmate- S.C. Delinquent History n=3,904 (45%)	PPP Offender- No S.C. Delinquent History n=6,501 (73%)	PPP Offender- S.C. Delinquent History n=2,447 (27%)
<u>Race:</u>				
White	41%	46%	60%	62%
Black	58% *	54%	39%	38%
<u>Adult Offense Category:</u>				
Person	22%	21%	11%	9%
Property	55%	63%	28%	33%
Public Order	22%	15%	40%	37%
All Other	1%	1%	21%	21%

*Other = <1%

Table VIII

**Social and Judicial Characteristics
of South Carolina Male Delinquents Born in 1967**

Social Characteristics		Judicial Characteristics	
<u>Race:</u>		<u>Delinquency Referrals:</u>	
Black	41%	One	63%
White	59%	Two	18%
Other	<1%	Three	8%
		Four	5%
		Five or More	6%
<u>Family Arrangement:</u>		<u>Delinquency Adjudications:</u>	
Natural Parents	40%	None	50%
Single Parent	37%	One	31%
Parent/Stepparent	12%	Two	10%
Other	12%	Three	5%
		Four or More	4%
<u>Family Criminal History:</u>		<u>Probation Dispositions:</u>	
No	77%	None	56%
Yes	23%	One	32%
		Two	9%
		Three or More	3%
<u>Family Annual Income:</u>		<u>Residential Evaluations:</u>	
Less than \$10,000	47%	None	78%
\$10,000 - \$19,000	34%	One	19%
\$20,000 or Greater	20%	Two or More	3%
<u>School Attendance:</u>		<u>Institutionalizations:</u>	
Normal Classroom	78%	None	91%
Not Attending	11%	One	6%
Special Ed. Program	9%	Two	2%
Other	2%	Three or More	1%
		<u>First Referral Offense:</u>	
		Act Against Person	8%
		Act Against Property	38%
		Act Against Order/Oth.	35%
		Status Offense	19%
		<u>Most Serious Adjudicated Offense:</u>	
		Act Against Person	12%
		Act Against Property	54%
		Act Against Order/Oth.	25%
		Status Offense	10%

Table IX
Probability of Adult Criminality
for South Carolina Male Delinquents Born in 1967
Based on Selected Social Variables

	No. of Delinquent Records	No. of Adult System Matches	Probability of Adult Criminality Based on This Variable
<u>Race:</u>			
White	2,593	456	18%
Black	1,830	452	25%
<u>Family Arrangement:</u>			
Natural Parents	1,627	292	18%
Not with Natural Parents:	2,465	575	23%
Single Parent	1,509	342	23%
Parent/Stepparent	473	97	21%
Other	483	136	28%
<u>Family Criminal History:</u>			
Yes	900	262	29%
No	3,033	579	19%
<u>Family Annual Income:</u>			
<\$10,000	1,827	465	25%
\$10,000 or More:	2,092	372	18%
\$10,000 - 19,999	1,319	264	20%
\$20,000+	773	108	14%
<u>School Attendance:</u>			
Normal Classroom	3,231	604	19%
Not in Normal Classroom:	900	274	30%
Not Attending	469	164	35%
Sp. Education	370	92	25%
Other	61	18	30%

Table X
Probability of Adult Criminality
for South Carolina Delinquent Males Born in 1967
Based on Selected Judicial Variables

	No. of Delinquent Records	No. of Adult System Matches	Probability of Adult Criminality Based on This Variable
<u>Total Delinquency Referrals:</u>			
One	2,824	359	13%
Two or More	1,638	549	34%
Two	795	187	24%
Three	350	115	33%
Four	218	90	41%
Five	129	69	53%
Six or more	146	88	60%
<u>Total Delinquency Adjudications:</u>			
None	2,245	272	12%
One or More	2,217	636	29%
One	1,369	271	20%
Two	467	177	38%
Three	206	91	44%
Four	106	56	53%
Five	49	28	57%
Six or more	20	13	65%
<u>Total Probation Dispositions:</u>			
None	2,501	338	14%
One or More	1,961	570	29%
One	1,401	351	25%
Two	416	158	38%
Three	109	45	41%
Four or More	35	16	46%
<u>Total Residential Evaluations:</u>			
None	3,474	514	15%
One or More	988	394	40%
One	824	306	37%
Two	152	80	53%
Three or More	12	8	67%

Table X - Continued

Probability of Adult Criminality
for South Carolina Delinquent Males Born in 1967
Based on Selected Judicial Variables

	No. of Delinquent Records	No. of Adult System Matches	Probability of Adult Criminality Based on This Variable
<u>Total Institutionalizations:</u>			
None	4,068	687	17%
One or More	394	221	56%
One	274	147	54%
Two	86	51	59%
Three or More	34	23	68%
<u>First Referral Offense:</u>			
Person	348	74	21%
Property	1,683	410	24%
Public Order/Other Criminal	1,579	270	17%
Status	849	154	18%
<u>Most Serious Adjudicated Offense:</u>			
Person	260	95	37%
Property	1,185	388	33%
Public Order/Other Criminal	542	116	21%
Status	227	38	17%

Table XI
Z Values for Difference of Proportions Tests

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Clear Adult Record</u> (n=32,899)	<u>Adult System Match</u> (n=6,351)	<u>SCDC Match</u> (n=3,904)	<u>PPP Match</u> (n=2,447)
Delinquent, Race Is Black	p= .38	p= .48 Z=14.92	p= .54 Z=19.32	p= .38 -
Delinquent, Living In Single Parent or Other Setting	p= .47	p= .56 Z=13.14	p= .58 Z=13.01	p= .51 Z= 3.82
Delinquent, Family Has Other Criminal/Delinquent Members	p= .22	p= .32 Z=17.18	p= .34 Z=16.78	p= .28 Z= 6.87
Delinquent, Family Income= \$10,000 at Time of Delinquency	p= .41	p= .53 Z=17.69	p= .57 Z=19.11	p= .46 Z= 4.85
Delinquent, Was Not Attending School or Had Special Education Status	p= .20	p= .30 Z=17.72	p= .33 Z=18.73	p= .26 Z= 7.10
2 or More Delinquency Referrals	p= .32	p= .62 Z=45.37	p= .68 Z=44.36	p= .51 Z=19.24
1 or More Delinquency Adjudications	p= .44	p= .71 Z=39.52	p= .76 Z=37.86	p= .63 Z=18.22
Probation As A Juvenile	p= .31	p= .49 Z=27.74	p= .52 Z=26.34	p= .46 Z=15.34
Institutionalized As A Juvenile	p= .06	p= .24 Z=46.09	p= .30 Z=50.71	p= .14 Z=15.43
Person or Property Offense Charged At 1st Referral	p= .42	p= .51 Z=13.25	p= .54 Z=14.31	p= .46 Z= 3.86
Person or Property Adjudication	p= .57	p= .74 Z=25.29	p= .78 Z=25.25	p= .62 Z= 4.82
<u>Variable</u>	<u>SCDC Inmate/Not Delinquent</u> (n=4,788)	<u>SCDC Inmate/ Delinquent</u> (n=3,904)	<u>PPP Offender/Not Delinquent</u> (n=6,501)	<u>PPP Offender/ Delinquent</u> (n=2,447)
Race Is White	p= .41	p= .46 Z= 4.68	p= .60	p= .62 Z= 1.73
Adult Offense= Property	p= .55	p= .63 Z= 7.53	p= .28	p= .33 Z= 4.63